



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT DISCOVERIES IN ETHIOPIA

GEORGE A. REISNER

HARVARD CAMP, GIZA PYRAMIDS, EGYPT

Ethiopia or Cush extends from the upper end of the First Cataract in the Nile southwards to somewhere near the junction of the White and the Blue Niles at Khartum. Strictly speaking, the name "Cush" was applied by the ancient Egyptians to that part of the valley which lies between the Second and the Fourth Cataracts while the name "Wawat" was given to that between the First and Second Cataracts. More general names were "Ta-set" (or perhaps "Ta-Khent"), "Khenthennefer," and "Tanehsi" (= Land of the Negroes), and a still more general name was "The Southern Lands," applied to all the southland including Wawat, Cush, Punt and the tribal districts along the Red Sea and in the eastern and the western deserts. The people of Ethiopia are usually called *nehshi* which is translated inaccurately "negro;" and *nehshi* are represented in the monuments as typical woolly-haired black men. But it is clear from the pictures of men from Ethiopia and from the skeletons found in the ancient cemeteries that Ethiopia was inhabited by a race, dark-skinned it is true, but easily distinguished from the true negro. Thus it is probable that the proverb in Jeremiah 13 23 ("Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?") was founded on the Egyptian tradition rather than on a first-hand knowledge of the Ethiopians.

The land of Ethiopia is the most barren part of the Nile valley, almost the only part which might be called poverty-stricken. Through the greater length of the country, the only cultivable fields are little patches of dark soil laid down in the mouths of the side ravines

which have been cut by the rare rain-fed desert torrents. A hundred miles of the valley above Halfa is so desolate that it is now called "the Belly of the Rock." Even in the most fruitful stretches, which are in southern Cush or Dongola Province, the cornland is rarely more than a few hundred yards across from desert to river bank. It is one of the seeming paradoxes of history that so unfertile a country should have been an object of desire to one great empire after another, and a still greater paradox that a royal family, grown great on such soil, should have mastered the whole of the Nile valley from Khartum to the sea. But the material resources of Ethiopia lay, not in fields, grazing lands, and in forests, but in the control of roads and water. The river is the only ample source of water as well as a great traffic way, and all the roads from Egypt to the south return to its banks. The communications with the ancient gold mines in the eastern desert depended on short roads which debouched into the valley. The great caravan routes from the north were three in number — the first along the eastern bank, the second along the western bank, and the third through the chain of oases which runs parallel to the valley in the western desert. The river itself and all these roads were at the mercy of him who held the control of Ethiopia. There is a fourth way — by ship through the Red Sea; but the harbors of this route on the western shore of the sea were also under Ethiopian control. From the region of Berber, caravan roads strike out east and west and south, to the Red Sea, to Darfur, to Abyssinia, and the headwaters of the Atbára, the Dinder, the Blue and the White Nile. Along all these roads, commanded by rulers of Ethiopia, caravans went northwards bearing ivory, leopard skins, ostrich eggs and feathers, resins, myrrh, incense, various plant products, gold, and black slaves, and southwards caravans bearing the products of Egypt — cloth, amulets and ornaments, alabaster vases of per-

fume, bronze tools and weapons. In all times the material resources of the governing power in Ethiopia have consisted of the income derived from taxing in one way or other this great trade and in exploiting the gold mines. The agricultural produce has barely supported a meagre population, and no industries were initiated except under Egyptian influence.

In addition to the information contained in a large number of inscriptions found in Egyptian tombs and on the rocks of Nubia, the material for the ancient history of Ethiopia has been enriched in recent years by the excavations of the Nubian Archæological Survey ¹ between Assuan and Dakka, and by those of the Harvard-Boston expedition at Kerma ² and at Napata.³ The excavations at Napata — Gebel Barkal, Nuri, and el-Kurruw — have yielded among other results the tombs of all the independent kings of Ethiopia, twenty-five in number, from 750 to about 300 B.C., and what is much more important, the chronological order of these kings. Thus the foundation is now laid for a history of Ethiopia including that part where it touches the history of Palestine. But to make clear the character of the Ethiopian monarchy of the time of Hezekiah and Isaiah it is necessary to review briefly the earlier history of the land and its people.

The history of Ethiopia falls into three great periods previous to 1000 B.C.⁴ — (a) that of the Egyptian trading caravans, from before the Fourth Dynasty (2900 B.C.) to the Middle Empire (2000 B.C.); (b) that of the Egyptian occupation, from the Twelfth Dynasty to the Hyksos period (2000 to 1600 B.C.); and (c) that of the Egyptian Viceroyalty, from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth

¹ Reisner, Nubian Archæological Survey, Bulletins Nos. 1-4; Report, 1907-1908; Firth, Nubian Archæological Survey, Bulletins Nos. 5-7; Reports, 1908-1910.

² Reisner, Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Nos. 69, 80.

³ Ibid., Nos. 89, 97; Journal of Egyptian Archæology, IV, 213-227; V, 99-112.

⁴ Reisner, Sudan Notes and Records, I, 3-17, 57-79, 217-237; II, 35-67.

Dynasties (1550 to 1100 B.C.). In all these periods Egypt was the determining factor in the life of Ethiopia, and the interest of Egypt lay largely in the trade with the south, but in the third period in the exploitation of the gold mines as well. During the first of these periods the deeds of the great caravan leaders — Kharkhuf, Pepynekt, Sebni, and Thety — are fairly well known from their tomb inscriptions. The remains of one of their trading stations dated by inscriptions was excavated by our expedition at Kerma; and the desolated character of the No Man's Land of Lower Nubia has been revealed by the Nubian Archæological Survey. During the second period, Cush was permanently occupied by an Egyptian force under a governor and accompanied by craftsmen and officials. The fortified administrative center, part of the town, two of the mortuary temples, and the great cemetery were excavated by the Harvard-Boston expedition at Kerma. This town was in fact an Egyptian colony settled at the upper end of the Third Cataract and commanding the most important part of Cush. That it was a real colony is shown by the fact that a curious Egypto-Nubian set of crafts and customs was initiated and ran a course of development which can be traced for over four centuries.

After the reconquest of Ethiopia by Ahmose I and Amenophis I, the third period was opened about 1550 B.C. by the establishment of an Egyptian Viceroyalty, the first holder of which was the titular "king's son" Thure, appointed by Amenophis I. The communications with Egypt were now chiefly by water and were kept permanently open, so that the Egyptian administration in Ethiopia lost its isolated colonial character. King's messengers and inspectors of the central bureaus of Thebes passed to and fro, and yearly the tribute fleet went down to Thebes, probably during the inundation. We have a list, perhaps complete, of twenty-three successive Egyp-

tian viceroys in Ethiopia, extending from about 1548 to about 1080 B.C., from Thure of the Eighteenth Dynasty to Paiankh of the Twenty-first. Temples were built at Napata, Gematon (Kawa), Delgo, Soleb, Semneh, Buhen (Halfa) in Cush proper, as well as the well known great series between Halfa and Assuan. Many of the forts built to safeguard the roads in the Middle Empire were still held. At each temple and fort there was an Egyptian community of officials, soldiers, and priests, while the cemeteries prove that other Egyptian communities were settled in almost every cultivable area in Lower Nubia and probably southwards of that. Some remnant of the older negroid population must have remained; but it was culturally Egyptianized, and by the end of this long period of four and a half centuries Ethiopia was a part of Egypt in administration, religion, and crafts, although the racial mixture was not purely Egyptian. A second great center of the religion of Amon-Ra was established at Napata (temple B 500, excavated by the Harvard-Boston expedition), and it may be taken as certain that the priesthood of Amon in Napata walked in the ways of the priesthood of Amon in Karnak.

For the period from 1000 to 250 B.C. the material for a historical reconstruction has hitherto been wanting, except for the brief period of about half a century (715-663 B.C.), when the kings of Ethiopia — Shabaka, Shabataka, and Tirhakah — ruled Egypt as an Ethiopian province. But in 1916, the Harvard-Boston expedition discovered the great royal cemetery begun by Tirhakah at Nuri, and in 1919 the old family cemetery begun by the founder of the Ethiopian royal family at el-Kurruw. Both of these cemeteries are within a ten-mile radius of Gebel Barkal, the religious center of Napata, the capital of Ethiopia. It has fortunately been possible by means of the archæological material to arrange all these tombs in a chronological order, which is certain except for two

minor details toward the end of the list. Thus the basis has now been won for beginning a connected history of the first independent kingdom of Ethiopia, that whose capital was at Napata from about 900 B.C. to about 300 B.C.

The remarkable fact appears from the graves of the six generations of ancestors found at el-Kurruw that the royal family of Ethiopia was Libyan in origin, and from a stela of a wife of Piankhy that they were of the southern Libyans, the Temehuw. The chief of the first generation had among his grave-furniture flint and chalcedony arrow-points of well known Libyan types, but also such an amount of gold and of first-rate Egyptian faïences and alabasters that he must have been in control of part if not the whole of the resources of Ethiopia. His date I estimate at about 900 B.C. plus or minus 20 years. It would thus appear that the movement of the northern Libyan tribes into the Delta was accompanied, or followed, by a movement of the southern Libyans into Ethiopia. The obvious road for the penetration of Ethiopia by the southern Libyans would be through the Selîma Oasis road, used from the earliest times to the present day. About 900 B.C. the chief of the Libyan invaders was settled at el-Kurruw, and here was the seat of the family certainly until the reign of Tirhakah. The graves of the first three generations show a progressive increase in the size and magnificence of the tombs; the next three generations were practically at a standstill, but the chief of the last of them was undoubtedly Kashta, who held the title of "king." The chiefs of these — the fourth to sixth — generations probably all called themselves "kings of Cush," and the chief of the seventh generation was Piankhy, the conqueror of Egypt, who assumed the fivefold titular of a king of Egypt. Then follow, at el-Kurruw the tombs of Shabaka and Shabataka, at Nuri the tomb of Tirhakah, and, returning to

el-Kurruw, the tomb of Tanutaman beside the pyramid of his father Shabaka.

Now it must be remembered that Ethiopia was as completely a cultural part of Egypt as the Delta; and the Temehuw Libyans of Ethiopia became as thoroughly Egyptianized as the Meshwesh Libyans of the Delta. The Meshwesh, coming earlier and into a richer part of the Nile Valley, were the first to gain political power, and ruled Egypt as the Twenty-second and Twenty-third Dynasties for two centuries. But the growth of the feudal character of their government led in the early part of the eighth century to a disintegration of the kingdom into more or less independent provincial principalities, of which Ethiopia was without doubt the most powerful, probably the first to attain complete independence. It is certain that about 750, Kashta, king of Ethiopia, already held Thebes and had forced the adoption of his daughter, Amenirdis I, as heir to the high-priesthood of Amon-Ra by Shepenwepet I, the daughter of Osorkon III. Piankhy, when he set out to defend his territory against the rising power of Tefnekht, a prince of Libyan origin who had gained control of Memphis and the Delta, counted himself over-lord of Middle Egypt as far as Heracleopolis. With the submission of Tefnekht, the whole of Lower Egypt came under the sovereignty of Piankhy; but Tefnekht remained prince of that region as the representative of the Ethiopian king. Thus the feudal system of government was applied by Piankhy to Lower Egypt and was still in existence in the time of Tirhakah and Assurbanipal. But Piankhy and his successors maintained a standing army and military agents in Egypt whose duty it was to preserve order and collect the tribute of the vassal princes.

Thus at the time when the kings of Assyria were conquering Palestine, the Egyptianized Libyan kings of Ethiopia were forcing their supremacy over Egypt and

transferring the political capital of the whole kingdom to Napata. As I mentioned above, the Ethiopians were not negroes, and their royal family, Libyan in origin, shows in their portrait-statues no trace of negro blood. We have now portraits of Tirhakah, Tanutaman, Atlanersa, Senkamanseken, Anlaman, and Aspalta (the fourth generation after Tirhakah), and the negro head given to Tirhakah by the sculptor of Esarhaddon on the Senjirli stela simply represents the prevailing idea of Ethiopians as "*neh̄si*," spread no doubt by the Egyptians. The ruling class in Ethiopia was Egyptian in culture, and indeed the royal family considered itself as peculiarly the favored people of Amon-Ra, the national god of Egypt.

Some historians have distinguished two Kashtas and as many as four Piankhys.⁵ That confusion is now swept away by the excavations at Napata, and the list may be set forth with certainty as to the order of the names but not as to all the dates. Starting with 525 B.C. as the date of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyeses, the maximum known reigns of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty⁶ give us 663 (with a possible error of a few months) for the end of the reign of Tirhakah. The reign of Tirhakah is known from one of the Serapeum inscriptions to have lasted twenty-six years and a few months. But beyond that the reigns are uncertain. For Shabataka the only date in the monuments is the third year, although Manetho gives him twelve or fourteen (Africanus) years. From the reign of Shabaka, a date in his twelfth year is preserved and one in his fifteenth (Dr. Budge), while Manetho again reports twelve years. Finally, the Conquest stela of Piankhy is dated in his twenty-first year, and the strip of linen in the British Museum purchased by Greene gives a period which is more than twenty and pos-

⁵ Petrie, *History of Egypt*, III, 279; Gauthier, *Livre des rois d'Egypte*, IV, 2, 24, 50, 51.

⁶ Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, I, 47; IV, 518, 519.

sibly more than forty years. With this material it is only possible to set out a series of dates which show a cumulative limit of error as the date recedes from 663 B.C. backwards (Kashta is numbered six, allowing five numbers for the ancestral chiefs found in the tombs, el-Kurruw, Tumulus I and XIX, Mastabas IX, XI, and XXIII):

	King of	Max.	Min.	Probable
6. KASHTA,	Ethiopia
	Ethiopia and Thebes	-743
7. PIANKHY,	Ethiopia and Thebes	755-734	733-712	743-722
son of 6.	Ethiopia and Egypt	734-715	712-704	722-714
8. SHABAKA,	Ethiopia and Egypt	715-701	704-692	714-700
son of 6.				
9. SHABATAKA,	Ethiopia and Egypt	701-689	692-688	700-689
son of 8.				
10. TIRHAKAH,	Ethiopia and Egypt	689-663	688-663	689-663
son of 7.				
11. TANUTAMAN,	Ethiopia and Egypt	663-661	663-661	663-661
son of 8.	Ethiopia and Thebes	661-655	661-655	661-655
	Ethiopia	655-653	655-653(?)	655-653(?)

In the probable dates I take Piankhy's reign at about twenty-nine years, based on the date in the hieratic inscription on linen, and Shabataka's at twelve years, based on Manetho and the archæological evidence at el-Kurruw.

The history of the relations between the kings of Ethiopia on the one hand and those of Assyria and Palestine on the other depends entirely on the Biblical and the cuneiform documents. It is true that Tanutaman in the Dream stela⁷ gives an account of his campaign to recover Egypt in 663, but he speaks of the Assyrian appointees merely as rebels and gives no hint of the conflict with Assurbanipal. For some time false conclusions were drawn from the Assyrian and the Hebrew materials owing to the confusion between "Cush" in Arabia and Cush-Ethiopia, and that between "Muşri" in Arabia and the Semitic name for Egypt. That difficulty was

⁷ Breasted, *loc. cit.*, IV, 468 f.

definitely cleared away by Professor Winckler;⁸ and it may now be accepted that the Assyrian annals of this period do not refer to Egypt before the reign of Esarhaddon, and that the only Biblical reference to Ethiopia of possible historical value is that to Tirhakah in II Kings 18, 19 (Is. 36, 37). The identification of So, king of Musri (in Arabia), in II Kings 17 4 (minimum date, 724), with Shabaka, king of Egypt (maximum date, 715), is obviously a mistake, while the Muşri, which with Milukhkha attempted to relieve Ekron in Sennacherib's campaign of 701, was certainly the Arabian Muşri, not Egypt. The reference in II Chron. 14 9-15 to Zerah the Cushite and his war with Asa of Judah, does not relate to Cush-Ethiopia but to the Arabian Cush (cf. II Chron. 21 16).

The utilization of the cuneiform material as far as it concerns Egypt under the Ethiopian dynasty is fairly easy. The chief events may be summarized as follows:⁹

- 705. Sargon killed in battle. Sennacherib came to the throne and was confronted by widespread resistance.
- 704-3. Campaign against Merodach-baladan and pacification of Babylonia.
- 702. Against the Kassites.
- 701. Campaign against Phoenicia, Philistia, and Judah. Attempt of the Arabian Musri and Milukhkha to relieve Ekron; their defeat at Eltekeh. Hezekiah pays tribute, but Jerusalem is not taken.
- 700-681. Sennacherib occupied in the East; Syria and Palestine apparently quietly tributary.
- 681. Sennacherib assassinated. Esarhaddon became king.
- 676-5. Abdimilkuti of Sidon, having revolted, was conquered and beheaded, together with his ally, Sanduarri of Kundi and Sizu.
- 674. Invasion of Arabia.

⁸ Winckler, *Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Ges.*, III (1898), Nos. 1, 4; XI (1906), 102-116; to Cush, p. 106; *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, 24-41.

⁹ See for example, Paton, *Early History of Syria and Palestine*, pp. 248 ff.; Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, 410-415, 525.

673. Invasion of Egypt and defeat of the Assyrians in Egypt (Knudtzon).
- 672-1. Campaign against Rurisa; perhaps also other eastern campaigns; perhaps beginning of internal troubles.
670. Invasion of Egypt. Defeat of Tirhakah at Iskhupri on third Tammuz; pursuit of Egyptian army to Memphis; Memphis taken on twelfth Tammuz; further battles (south of Memphis ?) on sixteenth and eighteenth of Tammuz. Submission of Egyptian vassals of Tirhakah as far as Thebes: their appointment as vassals of Esarhaddon. Tirhakah resumes his over-lordship apparently immediately after the departure of the Assyrian army.
669. Internal strife in Assyria between Esarhaddon and the officials and officers; many executions; solution found in appointment of Assurbanipal to be crown prince of Assyria, Shamashshumukin of Babylonia.
668. Esarhaddon marches again to Egypt and dies on the road. Assurbanipal continues the campaign and describes it as his own. Battle at Karbaniti; capture of Memphis; flight of Tirhakah [one month and ten days later, Thebes taken and plundered (K 2675)]. The twenty-two dynasts reëstablished as Assyrian vassals; Assyrian garrison left in Egypt.
- 668-663. Intrigues between Tirhakah and the dynasts of Sais, Mendes, and Tanis (Delta alone in Assyrian control). Assyrian commanders quell the revolt and send the three kings to Nineveh. Necho of Sais pardoned and restored as king in Sais. Tirhakah dies and is followed by Tanutaman, son of Shabaka.
- 663-2. Tanutaman retakes Memphis, and Assurbanipal makes his second campaign to Egypt (according to Tanutaman's Dream stela, Tanutaman took Memphis and received the submission of the Delta dynasts). Memphis taken without a battle; Thebes, after a march of one month and ten days, taken and plundered; Tanutaman flies to Kipkip (unknown place in the south). Thereafter the only mention in the annals of Assurbanipal is that referring to the alliance between Gyges and Psammetik I, in which the latter is said to have thrown off the Assyrian yoke.

These are the chief events; but there was also the revolt of Baal of Tyre, which Professor Winckler¹⁰ has reconstructed, with so much insight into the history of the times, somewhat as follows: Baal, disappointed at not regaining his territory on the mainland, made an alliance with Tirhakah and revolted in 673. Esarhaddon besieged Tyre and attacked Tirhakah, but was defeated by the latter. The siege of Tyre continued, and in 670 after the victory of Iskhupri Baal offered submission. But on the return of Tirhakah to Memphis Baal withdrew his submission, and therefore the Senjirli stela, on which Baal is represented behind Tirhakah, makes no mention of Baal. The siege lasted until Assurbanipal defeated Tirhakah in 688, when Baal gave up, thus having resisted for five years as related by Menander (Josephus). The final taking of Tyre is recorded as Assurbanipal's "third campaign." The first half of this reconstruction, it must be confessed, has little material support, (a) from the annals of Esarhaddon,¹¹ where the names of Baal and Tarku are both restorations by Winckler on the basis of the sign *ri* taken as the end of Sur-ri (Tyre); (b) a treaty between Baal of Tyre and Esarhaddon,¹² the date of which is impossible to determine (I question any date after 674); and (c) Assurbanipal.¹³ Thus there is no evidence against the following reconstruction: submission of Baal and treaty at the beginning of the reign of Esarhaddon; defeat of Esarhaddon in Egypt in 673; consequent revolt of Baal without any instigation by or alliance with Tirhakah; and later events as given by Winckler.

The character of the kings of the Ethiopian dynasty of Egypt as drawn from their inscriptions, their monu-

¹⁰ Winckler, *loc. cit.*, I, 524-526; II, 10-16.

¹¹ K 2671 (see Winckler, *Forschungen*, I, 524).

¹² K 3500 + 4444 + 10235 (*loc. cit.*, II, 10 f.; and Peiser, *Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Ges.*, III, No. 6, pp. 1-14.)

¹³ Rassam *Cyl.*, II, 49-66.

ments, and their burial customs, was proud and boastful, but at the same time bold and devoid of fear. Against the foes they had met previous to the coming of the Assyrians, they had been universally successful. They believed themselves the favorites of Amon-Ra and were confident in his power. Piankhy, Shabaka, and Shabataka appear to have spent little time in Egypt, and Tirhakah was the first to reside there. He had come down from Napata when a young man of twenty (Tanis stela ¹⁴), and had been crowned in Egypt. His predecessors, living at Napata, could hardly have taken any interest in affairs beyond their borders. Fragments of one tablet (or two) with the impression of the seal of Shabaka were found at Nineveh,¹⁵ but this tablet (or these tablets) may have contained only formal greetings. The Ethiopian kings could conceive of no land so rich and desirable as Egypt — their own land — of no ruler so powerful as themselves, of no god the equal of Amon-Ra. As far as we know, they never indulged in foreign adventures, and even the battles fought by Tirhakah against the Assyrians were in every case fought on Egyptian soil. For of course the conquest of Egypt by the Egyptian province, Ethiopia, was not a foreign war. Thus it is unlikely that Tirhakah played anything more than a passive part in Palestine and Syria. Information was brought to him no doubt, and probably messengers, perhaps even from Baal of Tyre, were received with hospitality; but why should Tirhakah seek to make trouble for Assyria? And why, if he had made trouble, did he make no effort to utilize the situation?

The news of the defeat of Assyria in Egypt in 673 must have sent a quiver through the whole of western Asia, and was duly noted in the dry record of the Babylonian chronicle. Yet the only consequence was the revolt of

¹⁴ Petrie, Tanis, II, pl. IX, No. 163; Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, IV, 456.

¹⁵ Budge, *The Egyptian Sudan*, II, 30.

Baal of Tyre. Palestine continued quietly paying tribute, and neither the hieroglyphic nor the Assyrian inscriptions preserved to us contain any hint that Tirhakah attempted to advance beyond his own borders either then or at any other time. On the other hand, the part of agitator in Palestine and Syria, assigned to Tirhakah, is contrary to the character and the general conduct of that king, as far as is known. I imagine that the victory of 673 only made Tirhakah more confident of his power and of his impregnable position. Nor do we need to assume an alliance between Baal and Tirhakah to find a motive for Esarhaddon's invasion of Egypt in that year. Egypt was the richest land left unplundered by the Assyrians, a land capable of an enormous annual tribute; while to the army which had penetrated Arabia in 674, the crossing of the desert between Palestine and Egypt was not a matter of too great difficulty. Both before and since then, other armies have made the trip with comparative ease, time and time again. Thus I come to the conclusion that Baal did not revolt before the Assyrian defeat of 673 at the instigation of Tirhakah, but afterwards, encouraged thereto by that defeat and trusting to the strength of Tirhakah only in the sense that they had a common enemy — Assyria.

As for the subsequent struggle between the Assyrians and Tirhakah, the one point in doubt is whether Assurbanipal took Thebes in 668 as well as in 663. Winckler¹⁶ believed that the account in K 2675 resulted from a confusion of the two campaigns by a scribe. Professor Breasted¹⁷ has pointed out that the large restorations carried out at Thebes for Tirhakah by Mentuemhat (one of the vassals in the list of Assyrian appointees) could only have been made during the period previous to 663, that they were probably made between 668 and

¹⁶ Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, 478 f.

¹⁷ Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, IV, 460.

663 and indicate that Thebes had been looted in 668. But that conclusion is by no means certain and the question must remain in doubt. However this may be, the chief point is that Tirhakah had no difficulty in reëstablishing himself after his defeat in 670, and that he recovered Upper Egypt after the fall of Thebes in 668. He was bold and obstinate in his stand against Assyria, as befitted a great king fighting on his own soil for his own country.

Assyria attempted to hold Lower Egypt on the same feudatory system as that already in use by the Egyptians and with the same princes; but Assyria was too far away to exercise an efficient control over this form of administration even when under the watchful eyes of Assyrian officers. The vassal princes of Egypt must have been galled by the oversight of foreign soldiers and preferred the lighter yoke of their own kinsmen. Assurbanipal confesses his constant difficulties, and finally appears to have adopted the expedient of setting up Necho at Sais and Memphis as a rival of Tirhakah. At this point a contemporary document, the Dream stela of Tanutaman,¹⁸ informs us that Tanutaman in his first year (663 B.C.) saw in a dream two serpents, which was interpreted to mean that he would be king over both the southland and the northland. He was then crowned in Napata, and went downstream stopping at all the principal temples to make offerings until he came against the "rebels" at Memphis. That is, Upper Egypt down to, but not including Memphis, had passed to him at the coronation in Napata. He took Memphis by assault and advanced without resistance into the Delta. After Tanutaman's return to Memphis the Delta princes came in and submitted. As this must have been in 663, the last campaign of Assurbanipal could not have been before that year and may indeed have been a year or two later. As late as

¹⁸ Breasted, *loc. cit.*, IV, 468 f.

656-55, a stela found at Thebes¹⁹ is dated in the ninth year of Tanutaman. Psammetik I, the son of Assurbanipal's favorite, Necho, counted his reign from 663 B.C., but he did not obtain Thebes until his tenth year. It is clear that Tanutaman lived and held Thebes until 655, when he either died or was forced to withdraw to Ethiopia. We have no further evidence of Ethiopian activity in Egypt, unless it be the fragment of a faïence plaque bearing the name of Senkamanseken (second king after Tanutaman), recorded from Memphis by M. Daressy.

With this outline of the relations between Assyria and Egypt in the Ethiopian period in hand, the passage in II Kings 18, 19, Isaiah 36, 37, may now be examined. Stade's division of the text into three parts has been generally accepted — (a) II Kings 18 14-16, (b) 18 13, 17-37, and 19 1-9, (c) 19 10-37.²⁰ Winckler and others raise a question as to whether 18 13 belongs to (a) or (b), and whether 19 9 belongs wholly or in part to (b) or (c). It is not a vital matter from my standpoint whether the Tirhakah verse belongs to (b) or (c), but I agree with Winckler in concluding that it is the introduction of (c). As it is admitted that Tirhakah could not have been "king of Ethiopia" in 701, two explanations have been favored — (1) that Tirhakah was commander of an army belonging to Shabaka (or Shabataka), and was either regent of Egypt or was given a title which he acquired later; (2) that Sennacherib made a later campaign and a siege of Jerusalem at a time when he, Hezekiah, and Tirhakah were, all three, kings of their respective countries.

It may be observed in the first place that Tirhakah in the hieroglyphic inscriptions bears one or more of the five traditional titles of the king of Egypt. These five titles have usually different names attached to them, but

¹⁹ Gauthier, *Livre des rois d'Egypte*, IV, 43, 68.

²⁰ Stade, *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1886, pp. 173 f.; Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 31; *Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Ges.*, III, No. 1, p. 33; *Prasek, Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Ges.*, VIII, No. 4.

the Ethiopian kings of this period were fond of using the same name with the first two or three titles. The name by which each one is now called is that attached to the title "son of Ra," and thus Tirhakah was "the son of Ra, Tirhakah;" but the Ethiopians sometimes used the personal name with the title "king of Upper and Lower Egypt." It is only on his funerary vases and figures, found in his tomb at Nuri, that Tirhakah is called simply "the Osiris, the king, Tirhakah." In the cuneiform inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, Tirhakah is called "king of Egypt and Ethiopia," except in one case, where *after the capture of Thebes in 668* he is called "king of Ethiopia."²¹ After 668, an Assyrian or a friend of Assyria might have referred to Tirhakah as "king of Ethiopia," and after 655, when Egypt and Ethiopia were divided into separate kingdoms, any writer might have given one of the Ethiopian kings of Egypt the title "king of Ethiopia," although it was inexact. But it is extremely improbable that any document of the time of Sennacherib could have described Tirhakah as "king of Ethiopia."

It is now quite clear that in 701, Tirhakah was neither king nor regent, and not even crown prince. The curious succession of the kings of Ethiopia (see above) excludes a law of direct inheritance from father to son, and rather implies that the succession fell to the eldest, or perhaps the most capable, member of the family. In 701, in the reign of Shabaka, the heir-apparent must have been Shabataka, who became king on the death of Shabaka. Tirhakah was passed over, although he was the son of Piankhy, the predecessor of Shabaka. He was neither old enough nor politically strong enough to take precedence of Shabataka; but when Shabataka died, he did take precedence of Shabaka's other son Tanutaman.²²

²¹ Rassam Cyl. C, I, line 123.

²² At el-Kurruw, Tirhakah buried Shabataka in the same state as Shabataka had buried Shabaka, and the queens of Shabataka he buried in tombs and with furniture like those of his own queens at Nuri.

According to the stela found at Tanis²³ which celebrates the visit to Egypt of Queen Aqlaqa, mother of Tirhakah and presumably a queen of Piankhy's, to see the glory of her son *after he had been crowned in Egypt*, Tirhakah left Napata when a youth of twenty and had not seen his mother since. The inference is that it was a long time, but the mutilated inscription gives no evidence by which the date of his coming to Egypt might be reckoned. Even if his coming was before 701, it could not have been much before, and Tirhakah must have been too young to have had the chief command in Egypt before the reign of Shabataka. Moreover the danger of having a member of the royal family so close to the succession in a position of such power would have been obvious to an old Oriental like Shabaka. It is not only impossible for me to accept the conclusion that Tirhakah led an army against Sennacherib for Shabaka, but even the conclusion that any Egyptian army crossed the frontiers of Egypt in 701. That conclusion would be contrary to the whole character of the Ethiopian kings and their settled foreign policy, as I judge it to have been and as it appears even in Tirhakah's wars with the Assyrians. Indeed it is quite clear that the power to which Hezekiah trusted and of which Isaiah must have spoken was Muṣri in Arabia, not the Egypt of the Ethiopian kings. Sennacherib relates that "the kings of Mu-ṣu-ri" summoned the forces of the king of Milukhkha and attempted to relieve Ekron. The relief of Ekron meant the defeat of the Assyrians and the relief of Jerusalem and all Palestine.

As for the second explanation whereby II Kings 19 9-37 is taken to be a record of a second expedition to Palestine and a second siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib, the chronological conclusions appear to be against it. According to the most reasonable conclusions on Judæan

²³ Petrie, Tanis, II, pl. IX, No. 163; Breasted, Ancient Records of Egypt, IV, 456.

chronology, Hezekiah ceased to reign in 691, while the Egyptian material shows that Tirhakah could not have come to the throne before 689. The annals of Sennacherib for the latter part of his reign are wanting, and the evidence for a later campaign to Palestine is based on the observation of Professor Winckler that Esarhaddon in Cyl. A, II, lines 55 ff. says that his father Sennacherib had captured Adumu the stronghold of Aribi-land. This expedition, which is not recorded in the known annals, must have taken place in the second half of the reign of Sennacherib, and proves, provided Adumu lies south of Palestine, that Sennacherib in later years passed by Jerusalem with an army. But in addition to the fact that the location of Adumu is unknown except that it was in territory inhabited by Arabs, the evidence is a long way from permitting the deduction that Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem between 691 and 681. The distinction which Dr. Prasek²⁴ makes between the military operations of Sennacherib at Jerusalem in 701 and a "siege," is unconvincing. The suggestion of a second siege depends in fact on nothing except the passage which it was invented to explain. And finally, the character of Tirhakah's foreign policy makes against the supposition of a foreign campaign in 691-681 as much as in 701. In 673, 670, and 688, Tirhakah met the Assyrians on Egyptian soil, and even after his victory of 673 did not interfere in Palestine. He was neither afraid of invasion nor covetous of so undesirable an addition to his territory as Palestine.

Considering then the reference to Tirhakah in II Kings 19 9 in the light of the above examination, the whole of part (c) of the passage presents a combination of Sennacherib, Hezekiah, and Tirhakah "king of Ethiopia"

²⁴ Stade, *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1886, pp. 173 f.; Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, p. 31; *Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Ges.*, III, No. 1, p. 33; Prasek, *Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Ges.*, VIII, No. 4.

which is a historical impossibility. So far I was bound to go in my examinations of all possible materials for the history of Ethiopia. I may add that as a consequence I come to the conclusion that the editor of II Kings, having a late version of the prophetic utterances of Isaiah which he wished to incorporate with part (b), provided an introduction from his general knowledge of history to distinguish it from part (b). It is of course possible that he believed part (c) to have been another occasion, or that he found part (c) with its introduction already in existence dressed up by some former editor. The composer of part (c) in its present form appears to have had a confused knowledge of Tirhakah's wars with Esarhad-don and Assurbanipal, and possibly of the relief expedition from Muṣri, which he naturally confused with Egypt.²⁵

To sum up, the royal family of Ethiopia, to which belonged the kings of the Egyptian Twenty-fifth Dynasty, took its origin from a Libyan chief who settled at Napata about 900 B.C. Ethiopia was then as always the land of the southern roads, and thus the material resources on which this chief and his descendants founded the family fortunes came from the control of the trade routes and the gold mines. The normal population supported by the agricultural areas of Ethiopia is small, but with a large income from the traffic the rulers of Ethiopia were able to draw levies from the negro and the desert tribes. Individually men of courage and successful in the military occupation of Ethiopia, favored by the political disintegration of Egypt, these Libyan chiefs gained the headship of the Nile valley, held it for about eighty years, and then went down to defeat before the invading Assyrians. Their losses in men, accumulated wealth, and pres-

²⁵ The origin of the story of Sethon, Sennacherib, and the field mice, related by Herodotus (*see* Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, pp. 5-12), is a legitimate subject for investigation; but the statements contained in the story cannot at present be utilized for the examination of the question in hand.

tige in their ill-fated struggles with the Assyrians, perhaps also a degeneration of character in Tanutaman and Atlanersa, reduced them to inferiority to the king of Sais, Psammetik I, and they withdrew to Ethiopia, which Psammetik was not able to include in his kingdom. Thus Ethiopia, for centuries a province of Egypt and for eighty years the dominant province, was separated from the mother country under independent kings descended, at least at first, from those who had ruled Egypt. Tanutaman was succeeded by a king named Atlanersa, probably a son of Tirhakah.²⁶ He began a temple to Amon at Gebel Barkal, which we excavated in 1916, but he must have died unexpectedly. Only one room was completed and a beautiful granite altar set up in it; but the reliefs in that room and the front part of the temple were unfinished. Neither of the great granite statues intended to stand before the outer pylon was ever completed; one was found on its side in the debris before the temple, and the other is still lying in the quarry at Tombos. He was buried in a small tomb at Nuri (Pyr. XX), the second king's pyramid in that cemetery. It was his successor, Senkamanseken, who appears to have revived the fortunes of the family. He finished the temple of Atlanersa at Barkal, and placed at least three fine granite statues of himself in the Great Temple there (found by us in 1916). At Nuri he built the first of the large three-room stairway-pyramids (28 m. square), and his burial was carried out with great ostentation. His reign was marked by an accumulation of wealth and by the fact that his craftsmen participated in the development of the Egyptian renaissance. I refrain from giving the list of subsequent kings down to 300 B.C. or beyond, which we have recovered, inasmuch as the

²⁶ The pronunciation of these names of Ethiopian kings after Tanutaman is conjectural. The writing gives only the consonants. The forms I adopted in 1917 are merely pronounceable ones in which the original hieroglyphic forms may be recognized. My justification in rejecting forms based on the Meroitic now appears in the fact that the names are for the greater part of Libyan origin.

names would be meaningless to any one but a specialist in Egyptian history. Suffice it to say that Senkamanseken was followed by five kings whose scribes and craftsmen clung closely to the Egyptian traditions; but the fortunes of the last two of the five gradually declined. The next two dynasties, also buried at Nuri and therefore probably claiming descent from Tirhakah (by marriage?), present a progressive departure from the Egyptian traditions, and about 350–300 B.C. the degeneration had produced a curious Egypto-Ethiopian culture closely resembling the Meroitic. Long before 300 B.C. the Ethiopian kings, cut off from Egypt, had turned their attention to the South and had developed the country about Baru'a (supposed to be Meroë). In the time of Nastasan, the last king buried at Nuri, the political seat was at Baru'a, but Napata remained the religious capital, the place of coronation and burial. After Nastasan's death, the royal cemetery was opened at Meroë (Kabushiyah), and at that time the political capital probably became the seat of the chief temple and of the priestly hierarchy. In the first century B.C. either Napata became again the capital of Meroitic Ethiopia, or it was the seat of an independent kingdom of Napata, detached from the kingdom of Meroë. For during this century pyramids were again built at Napata, this time at Gebel Barkal (excavated by us in 1916), the Great Temple of Amon and that built by Atlanersa-Senkamanseken were restored, and numerous buildings, administrative and religious, were constructed for the first time. The Ethiopia or Cush known to the Greeks and Romans was that of the Meroitic kingdom, and the name "Ethiopia" was first given to Cush by them. In spite of the long accounts of the classical writers, the history of the Meroitic Kingdom is still in obscurity, and it is the hope of the Harvard-Boston expedition to continue its researches in Ethiopia by excavating the royal cemetery of Meroë.